|--|

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge			I. Shadur	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge				
CASE NUMBER		98 CI	R 54 - 2	DATE	12/22	/2004		
CASE TITLE			USA vs. Darwin Montana					
[In the following box (a) indicate the party filing the motion, e.g., p of the motion being presented.]					ndant, 3rd party plaintiff, and	(b) state briefly the nature		
Motion under 18 U.S.C. 3582								
DOCKET ENTRY:								
(1)								
(2)		Brief in support of motion due						
(3)		Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due						
(4)								
(5)	☐ Star	Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at						
(6)	☐ Pre							
(7)	☐ Trial[set for/re-set for] on at							
(8)	□ [Be	ench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at						
(9)		his case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] FRCP4(m)						
[Other docket entry] Enter Memorandum Order. Certainly no holding of such retroactivity is implied either by Blakely itself or by Booker or Fanfan. That being so, this Court views itself as being without jurisdiction to grant the relief sough by Montana, and his motion is denied summarily.								
(11) For further detail see order attached to the original minute order.]								
	No notices required, advised in open court.					Document Number		
1	No notices require Notices mailed by		{		number of notices			
	Notified counsel b	_	j		DEC 23 2004			
	Docketing to mail	notices.			BILL	CO		
	Mail AO 450 form.		Index Tubble	13 -2.U	Confessing deputy metials	97		
Copy to judge/magistrate judge.					12 <i>722/2</i> 004	, u		
SN		courtroom deputy's	इंड ह्या एक्ट्री	323 1868	date mailed notice			
}.		initials	Date/tim	e received in	možino demoty initialit			

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

United States of America)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.) No. 98 CR 54-2	DOCKETED
Darwin Montana)	DEC 23 2004
Defendant.	;	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Darwin Montana ("Montana") has just submitted a selfprepared filing in which he joins the legion of convicted federal
felons who seek to obtain relief, years after their convictions
and sentencings, based on the Supreme Court's decision in <u>Blakely</u>
<u>v. Washington</u> as applied in <u>United States v. Booker</u>, 375 F.3d 508
(7th Cir. 2004). In this instance Montana attempts to call 18
U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) into play, although the terms of that statute
obviously do not apply to his situation. But this Court will
ignore that mistaken effort, focusing instead on Montana's motion
as such.

Everyone involved in the criminal justice system is awaiting the decision of the United States Supreme Court in its pending review of <u>Booker</u> and the related decision in <u>United States v.</u>

<u>Fanfan</u> (both cases were argued before the Court on October 4, 2004). But nothing suggests any likelihood that the Supreme Court's ruling in those cases will include a retroactive application and extension of the <u>Blakely</u> principles that would

open up for potential revision the many thousands of long-agoimposed sentences such as Montana's. Certainly no holding of
such retroactivity is implied either by <u>Blakely</u> itself or by

<u>Booker</u> or <u>Fanfan</u>. That being so, this Court views itself as being
without jurisdiction to grant the relief sought by Montana, and
his motion is denied summarily.

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Wulton Doludin

Date: December 22, 2004